Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, DC

| In the Matter of: | | |
|---|---|---------------------|
| Request for Review of the Decision |) | |
| of the Universal Service Administrator by |) | |
| • |) | File No. SLD-507445 |
| Richland County School District 1 |) | |
| BEN Number: 127145 |) | CC Docket No: 02-6 |
| |) | |
| Schools and Libraries Universal Service |) | |
| Support Mechanism |) | |
| |) | |
| Wireline Competition Bureau |) | |

REQUEST FOR REVIEW

Introduction

Section 54.719(c) of the Commission's rules provides that any person aggrieved by an action taken by a division of the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) may seek review from the Commission.¹ Richland County School District 1 (Richland) hereby appeals the denial by USAC of a Funding Year 2006 funding request.

BACKGROUND

As part of a Selective Review done during Funding Year 2005, Richland provided the Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) with copies of the District's Request for Proposal (RFP), bid responses, and score evaluations for all of their funding requests. One of the sets of documents provided was for the RFP Richland released October 10, 2003, for web-based communications.² All bid responses were due November 7, 2003, and the

¹ 47 C.F.R. § 54.719(c).

² On the same day, Oct. 10, 2003, Richland also posted Form 470 No. 200420000460509. As far as the District knows, the SLD does not have any issues with the District's bid process. The issue the SLD has is with how the District evaluated the received bid responses.

received bids were evaluated and scored by November 23, 2003. As a result of this competitive bidding process, Richland chose eChalk as their service provider.

On February 6, 2007, Richland received a Funding Request Decision Letter (FCDL) for Application No. 507445. When they received the FCDL, Richland learned that FRN 1394371 was denied for the following reason, "Documentation provided demonstrates that price was not the primary factor in selecting this service provider's proposal." This FRN referred back to the selection of eChalk done in 2003.

Richland appealed the decision to USAC on March 23, 2007, and addressed the denial reason given on the FCDL.³ As part of the appeal, Richland attached the Evaluation Scorecard as given in the RFP. The Scorecard showed the 5 areas to be used in scoring the bid responses along with the weight each section was given. The sections as listed in the RFP along with their given weights are as follows:

```
Section 1 – Service (20%)
Section 2 – Support (20%)
Section 3 – Training (20%)
Section 4 – Experience/References (15%)
Section 5 - Cost (25%)
```

One week later on March 30, 2007, Richland received the Administrator's Decision on Appeal.⁴ For the first time, Richland was told that the SLD denied the FRN at issue because the District did not consider Sprint when it came time to evaluate the bid responses based on cost. For the following reasons, Richland requests the FCC find the District properly evaluated the bid proposals received.

DISCUSSION

Richland complied with FCC guidelines in the selection of eChalk

Since Richland released and evaluated the bid responses at issue before the *Ysleta Order* was issued in December of 2003, the guidance found in the Commission's *Tennessee*

³ A copy of the March 23, 2007 appeal is attached as Exhibit A.

⁴ A copy of the Administrator's Decision on Appeal is attached as Exhibit B.

Order is applicable.⁵ The use of the *Tennessee Order* is consistent with the FCC's decision in the *Academia Discipulos de Cristo Order* released by the Commission in 2006.⁶ In the *Tennessee Order*, the FCC found that an applicant has complied with FCC competitive bidding requirements if the applicant has taken price into account during the bid selection process and the applicant selects the most cost-effective bid.⁷ In determining cost-effectiveness, the applicant may consider factors such as prior experience, personnel qualifications and management capability.⁸

The Evaluation Scorecard used by Richland to score the web-based communications bids clearly indicates price was taken into account. There is nothing in the criteria from the *Tennessee Order* that would require Richland to select the lowest bidder irregardless of the quality of service that bidder could provide. Richland complied with all FCC rules and regulations when they selected what was the most cost-effective bid from eChalk.

Sprint was mathematically eliminated

Richland had no reason to perform the cost evaluation on the Sprint proposal as Sprint was already mathematically eliminated. Per the evaluation process as given in the RFP, all bids received would go through a 3 phase evaluation. First, all bids must meet the mandatory requirements, such as being received on time, having the correct number of copies, all requested sections being present, etc. At this point in the evaluation process, one of the received bids was eliminated. Blackboard Inc. only submitted marketing material and did not send a signed bid response as required.

⁵ See Request for Review by Ysleta Independent School District of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21, Order, 18 FCC Rcd 26406 (2003) (Ysleta Order), and See Request for Review by the Department of Education of the State of Tennessee of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator, Request for Review by Integrated Systems and Internet Solutions, Inc., of the Decision of the Universal Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., CC Docket Nos. 96-45 and 97-21, Order, 14 FCC Rcd 13734 (1999) (Tennessee Order).

⁶ See Request for Review by Academia Discipulos de Cristo, et. al, File Nos. SLD 358081, 358083, et. al, CC Docket No. 02-06, Order, 21 FCC Rcd 9210 (Wireline Comp. Bur. 2006) (Academia Discipulos de Cristo Order)

⁷ See Tennessee Order, 14 FCC Rcd at 13737-39, paras. 7-9.

⁸ Id. at 13739-40, para. 10. See also 47 C.F.R. §§ 54.504(b)(2)(vii), 54.511(a).

The remaining four bids from eChalk, School Center, Sprint, and Timecruiser Computing Corporation entered Phase II of the evaluation process. For Phase II, an eight member evaluation panel scored the received bids on their technical merit. Per local procurement rules, this panel is only given the technical proposals as submitted by each bidder. The panel is not allowed to see the pricing proposals in order to achieve an unbiased evaluation on the technical merits.

In evaluating the four web-based communications proposals, each bid response received an evaluation score based upon the listed evaluation criteria of service, support, training and experience/references. Once the panel finished scoring the bids on the technical merits, the evaluations were returned to the Procurement Office for cost to be factored into the decision. It was at this point that the Sprint bid response was eliminated. As the attached evaluation sheets from the eight member panel show, even if Sprint received the maximum amount of points possible for pricing, their technical score was so low Sprint could not win the contract. For this reason, the Procurement Office did not evaluate the Sprint cost proposal.

The SLD is denying Richland funding for not evaluating a proposal that could not win. Richland does not see a requirement in the stated FCC guidelines that would require an applicant to continue to evaluate a bid which has no mathematical chance of winning.

Additionally, Richland complied with all local rules regarding the evaluation of competitive sealed bids. Attached as Exhibit D is a memo from the Director of Procurement at Richland. As stated in the memo, "This solicitation was conducted in full accordance with the District Procurement Code. The District used the competitive sealed proposals (RFP) process as the method of source selection. This method is used when it has been determined that factors others than price may be considered. Price was the criterion given the most weight in the scoring."

_

⁹ See the evaluation scores attached as Exhibit C.

SLD did not give explanation for denial

The SLD did not give a complete explanation for denying Richland's funding request until issuing the Decision on Appeal. Without this knowledge, Richland was not able to adequately address the real issue on appeal to USAC. Richland had no knowledge that the SLD was questioning the elimination of the Sprint bid, since the District was never asked by SLD why Sprint was eliminated. If the SLD had asked during the Selective Review or during PIA regarding the elimination of Sprint, the District could have provided the above explanations.¹⁰

SUMMARY

Richland requests the FCC find that the District did properly evaluate the bids received and remand the case back to USAC with orders to fund the FRN at issue due to the fact Richland received and evaluated multiple bids in compliance with FCC, state and local competitive bidding practices.

Sincerely Submitted,

Walter L. "Luke" Fox

Executive Director, Information Technology

Richland County School District 1

1616 Richland Street Columbia, SC 29201

¹⁰ See Request for Review by Approach Learning and Assessment Center, Santa Ana, CA, et.al., File Nos. SLD-140957, et.al., CC Docket No. 02-6, Order, DA 07-1332 (March 23, 2007) which directs USAC to be more specific in their requests during Selective Review and PIA.



April 6, 2007

via e-mail: appeals@sl.universalservice.org

Letter of Appeal Schools and Libraries Division - Correspondence Unit 100 South Jefferson Road PO Box 902 Whippany, NJ 07981

LETTER OF APPEAL FRN DENIAL

Applicant:

Richland County School District 1

Entity Number:

127145

Form 471 Application No.:

507445

Funding Year:

2006

FRN Numbers:

1394371

The Richland County School District 1 ("School District"), by its undersigned representative, hereby appeals the FRN denial decision of the Schools and Libraries Division ("SLD") of the Universal Service Administrative Company in the abovecaptioned matter.

ISSUE FOR CLARIFICATION ON APPEAL:

Was the SLD reviewer was correct in determining that, "Documentation provided demonstrates that price was not the primary factor in selecting this service provider's proposal."

STATEMENT OF FACTS AND DISCUSSION

As part of a selective review, the School District provided bid documentation to the SLD. One document provided at that time was the bid Evaluation Scorecard to be used for the selection of a service provider. The Evaluation Scorecard is provided again as Exhibit A.

The Scorecard is divided into 5 sections, with each section further broken out into the actual components of that particular section. On page 8 of the Scorecard, each section is listed along with the weight factor that section will receive. The 5 sections and their weights are as follows:

Section 1 – Service (20%)

Section 2 – Support (20%)

Section 3 – Training (20%)

Section 4 – Experience/References (15%)

Section 5 - Cost (25%)

The FCC guidance for bid documentation states that price must be the primary factor. ¹ The Commission also gave an example for considering price as the primary factor. "The Commission stated that if, for example, a school assigns 10 points to reputation and 10 points to past experience, the school would be required to assign at least 11 points to price."

The Evaluation Scorecard clearly indicates price was given the most weight of the five sections. Since price was the primary factor in evaluating the bids received, the School District complied with all FCC rules and regulations.

¹ See Request for Review by Ysleta Independent School District of the Decision of the Universal Service Administrator, CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21, Order, 18 FCC Rcd 26406, 26429, para. 50 (2003) (Ysleta Order).

² Ysleta at n.138, as quoted by Request for Review by Academia Discipulos de Cristo, et. al, File Nos. SLD 358081, 358083, et. al, CC Docket No. 02-06, Order, 21 FCC Rcd 9210 (Wireline Comp. Bur. 2006) (Academia Discipulos de Cristo Order), para. 6.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION REQUESTED

Accordingly, the School District requests that the SLD reverse its decision and fund the FRN at issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Walter L. Fox

Executive Director

Richland County School District One

1616 Richland Street

Columbia, SC 29201

| Standard Feature Not Available Tipoint. (Ref. RFP, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|-------------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|---|--|--|--------------------|-------------|------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| Service Specifications (Ref. Rection 2.0) Password-protected User Accounts, with secure socket layer (SSL) capability (Ref. RFP, Section 2.1.1) | E-mail with remote access for all school members, students, teachers, staff and parents (Ref. RFP, Section 2.1.2), to include: | • Common format for all school members (e.g. Jane.Doe@domain.com) | Minimium of SMB of e-mail storage space for each user (expandable) | Pops, IMAP, and WAP compliant | Multiple attachment sending capability | Return receipt, urgent and signature settings | e Return receipt, urgent and signature settings | Customizable key word, domain, and attachment filtering, shadowing and blocking | E-mail monitoring by the site manager, parents, and/or teachers | s E-mail filtering available | Pensonal address book that allows for storage of name, address, phone, e-mail, etc. | Ability for administrators and feachers to create distribution lists | Security options to block users from sending/receiving e-mail from outside of the school | Directory of users | Spell check | Virus protection | User Account E-File storage and sharing (Ref. RFP, Section 2.1.3), to include: | Minimum of 5MB of file storage space per user (expandable) | Minimum of 25MB file storage for shared files per site (expandable) | File sharing between teachers and their students | File sharing between teachers and administrators |

| the definition we design the design of the second | WWW.manonanana | | | | |
|--|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| | Œ | File sharing between district and schools | | | A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE |
| NAMES AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE | * | File storage monitoring by the site manager, parents, and/or teachers | | | |
| O Morganista Nova Octobrilla Octobrilla superage | - K | Virus protection | | | |
| * * * * * | ser Acc | User Account Bookmark storage and sharing (Ref. RFP, Section 2.1.4), to include: | | | · |
| | * | Web addresses stored online and accessible from any computer | | | |
| M fil filmingles expenyingels/bibliomedynates | Ö | One-click storage of favorite Web sites (can be used while browsing Web sites) | | | |
| 1 y de la la destaction de la lacial de lacial de la lacial de lacial de la lacial de la lacial de lacia | | Bookmarks sharing between teachers and students | | | |
| 1.5 U | Iser Acc | User Account Member Directory requirements (Ref. RFF, Section 2.1.5), to include: | | | |
| | • | Individual search, enabling school/District members to quickly find other members by name, title, grade, position and subjects faught | | The state of the s | Anni (principal anni martin e delle Anni Adelpha (Anni Adelpha (Anni Adelpha (Anni Adelpha (Anni Adelpha (Anni |
| | <u>ن</u> | Group search, facilitating the quick sending of communication to groups | | | A COMMENSATION OF THE PARTY OF |
| | * Q4 | District-level search, allowing the District to reach, for example, all 8th grade teachers, or all K-4 parents | | | |
| 1.6 S | ChoolD | School/District Web Presence (Ref. RFP, Sections 2.2.1), to include: | | | |
| | , A | Individuel URLs for the district and each of its schools. | | | |
| | Sc. | School/District calendar, viewable to the general public | | | |
| | ő | Daily school/District announcement/site message for time-sensitive communications | | | |
| | ā | Priholpal/Superintendent message to Inform or rafly support | | | |
| | Sc. | School/District name and logo to brand the entity | | | |
| | ပိ | Contact Information with location map and directions | | | |
| | * | Multilingual online help features | | | And the second control of the second control |
| A CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY O | ο O | Downloadable "Getting Started" Instructions | | | |
| | ō * | Current tocal weather tracker | | | от на при |
| A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR | Š | Searchable faculty & staff directory, class & school listing | The second secon | THE SECURITY OF THE SECURITY O | A COMMISSION OF THE PARTY OF TH |
| | int s | intégrated voice component accessibility | Andreas and the second | о на навида водил делегурива е е е на предуства гредина водина водина водина водина водина водина водина водина | And the second s |

| 1.7 | Schoolibi | School/District resource pages that are customizable (Ref. RFP, Section 2.2.2), to include: | Standard Feature 2 points | Optional Feature | Not Available |
|--|--|---|------------------------------|--|--|
| N | ************************************** | Strarable District resources | | | |
| A common or other contract or | e Te | Tepcher/Staff Web pages organized by department | | | |
| | 300 | Schoo/District Acceptable Use Policy | | | The second secon |
| K-4 vordel/Whatman | DI. (| Wod-safe" Web search engine | | | |
| A CONTROL OF THE CONT | , W. | Web publishing tools with olipart available | | | |
| | 3 | Curticulum material posing and management for teachers | | | |
| eo | Classmon | Classroom Web pages (Ref. RFP, Section 2.2.3), to include: | | | |
| | • | Grade book tool | | | AND THE REAL PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY ADDRESS OF THE PROPE |
| | ¥ | Attandance tool | | | The state of the s |
| | ð | Cuiz generator tool | | | |
| | * CE | Discussion board | | | en e |
| | ¥. | Areas for announcements, class catendar, class materials, links to web resources | | | TO CALL THE STATE OF THE STATE |
| | å | Doumentarchiva | | And the Control of Comment of the Control of the Co | (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) |
| | Ö | Class maintenance tools | | | And the state of t |
| | • Ab | Ab illy for teacher to add/delete/modify events on the school calendar | | | A A MARIE MANAGO ANTINI CONTRACTOR ANTINI CONTRA |
| N) wasan was de marco | * Ab | Ability for teacher to add/delete/modify daily announcements | | Note that the second section of the section of the second section of the section of the second section of the second section of the second section of the s | |
| | 4 | Ability for teacher to change passwords for the students | | | |
| 6. | Site Mana | Site Management features (Ref. RFP, Section 2.2.4), to include: | | | |
| TO BEAUTY OF THE STATE OF THE S | 2 | 25MB hosting space (expandable) per school/District site for uploaded files | | | en la destructura de la companya de |
| Partie of the Pa | A. | Ability to create new Web pages from templates | | | фи муниций (убраний) интексительной увремення датамих датамих (утиндей тут и посколятите те |
| | AB | Ability to post links to other Web siles of Interest to the school community | | and the second s | ARTER AND THE STATE OF THE STAT |
| an vasco to second | * AB | Ability to addideleteramodify users | | | жендаруулын ала бартандаруу арадан ол Мунун ундамалын аланын (петендеру — физика ортогору арадага |
| | • Ab | Abiliy to change passwords | | | ен Таг/сености (одорин какай) Мацадария изберуулуунда мамиту түзгөрөдө |
| | | | | | |

| \$Podeniana-minutesisty paperate many and automostic engine. | | | THE RESERVE THE PROPERTY OF TH | |
|--|--|---|--|---|
| * | Ability to manage groups of users | | | |
| | Ability to suspend user privileges | | | |
| | Ability to monitor user's e-mail and file storage accounts | | | |
| | Ability to centrally manage multiple schools within the District | | | |
| * | Ability to add/delete/modify events on the school calendar, dally announcements and/or the sile message | | | maja dalah dalah di Abberta dalah |
| * | Ability to "push" down District calendar Nems, amouncements, site messages and resources to the school pages | | | |
| ₹ . | Ability to control and modify the public sections of the schools' sites | | | |
| = 63 | Infegrated reporting capabilities that allow site administrators to track of the number of accounts in use, site hosting & site files in use, and inclividual user e-mail & file storage usage | | | mana benda dentri i van meremen e occepti ja pre mange canter e General de |
| TOTALS SECTION 1.0 | ON 1.0 | | | |
| OVERALL SCO | OVERALL SCORE SECTION 1.0 | | | |
| Weets all Service | Weets all Service Specifications as standard features * 5 points | | | |
| Meets most (504 | Weets most (50+) Service Specifications as standard features = 4 points | | | |
| Meets some (30- | Meets some (30-50) Service Specifications as standard features, with some as optional ≔ 3 points | • | • | |
| Meets few (10-3) | Meets few (10-30) Service Specifications as standard features, with most as optional = 2 points | | Melalistica (Salamente | |
| Meets no Service | Weets no Service Specifications as standard features, with most as optional = 1 point | | | |
| | | | | |

| e R | 7 | e e | | | Acceptance y a constitution of the constitutio |
|--|---|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| Support | Pre-delly | Setup (R | * | * | L • |
| Support Shecifications (Ref. RFF; Section 3.0) | Pre-delivery consultation (Ref. RFP, Section 3.1) | Setup (Ref. RFP, Section 3.2), to include: | Selup and configuration | Training of all designated RCSD1 personnel | Transfer of applicable data from the RCSD1 student Information system (SASI), management information system [MUNIS], and communication system (GroupWise) to the new system |
| | | | | | l student information sys cation system (GroupWi |
| | | A CONTRACTOR AND A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR | | AND AND THE REAL PROPERTY OF THE PROPERTY OF T | stem (SASI), menag se) to the new syste |
| | | | | | Jement em |
| Standard Feeture | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Optional Enature | | | | | |
| eature?! | | | | | |
| Not Available | | | | | |
| ilable i nts | : | | | | |

| EVALUATOR NAME: | DATE | OFFEROR NAME |
|-----------------|------|--------------|

| es. | System 1 | System Management (Ref. RFP, Section 3.3), to include: | Conforms Does Not Conform 2 Points | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | ************************************** | A fully outsourced Web-based communication solution (or if system is to be hosted on-site at Richland One, all setup and maintenance to be performed by the vendor) | | |
| TOTAL MARKET NAME OF THE PARTY | | A documented high-level of system security and rollability | | |
| And the second second | *************************************** | A highly experienced technical team of software network engineers on call to maintain security, performance, and uptime | | |
| 2,4 | Schools | Schools interoperability Framework (SIF) (Ref. RFP, Section 3.3.1) | | |
| we continue to the same of the | and contraction with the second secon | Is vendor or product involved at any level with the SIF initiative? | | |
| DI LOTTE LANCACION DE LA CONTRACTOR DE L | | ts product SIF compliant, having an existing software agent (or a plan for the creation of one)? | | |
| 89 82 | Security | Security and Reliability (Ref. RFP, Section 3.3.2) | | |
| | | Enterprise servers featuring the highest levels of performance and scalability with expandable bandwidth | | |
| | • | Hardware frewall protection with IP filtering | | |
| | Ø. | Secure "DMZ" software layer | | |
| | * | Secure socket layer capability for transmission of sensitive data | | |
| | 4 | Daliy hackup of all data, files, and e-mail | | |
| | 5 | Virus profection | | |
| | e | Redundant file, mail and database servers | | |
| | Ž. | Redundant Internet access | | |
| | * | 24/7 system monitoring and support | | |
| | æ | Protection of data from power outages, fire, and theft | | |
| Anthrony Communities. | *MARTET STATE STAT | | And being the control of the control | |

EVALUATOR NAME:

DATE:

OFFEROR NAME:

(: ·.

| 2.6 Technica | Technical Support (Ref. RFP, Section 3.3.3), to include: | Standard/Fedure Coptional/Feature Not-Available Zpoints Toolnt Uppoints |
|----------------------------|--|---|
|)] • | Total system maintenance (with 24hr advance notice to District of maintenance) | |
| 9 | Immediate response (within 24hrs) to critical problems or issues | |
| 9 | Support package coverage of at least 2 years | |
| • | Timely and automatic upgrades and upgrade information | |
| 3 | Dedicated support personnel for each school in the District | |
| 5 | On-site support, when necessary | |
| | Periodic usage reports generated to gauge use of various features | |
| | Toll-free telephone support | |
| | E-mail support | |
| 5 | On-line help and screen tips | |
| TOTALS SECTION 2.0 | N 2.0 | |
| OVERALL SCONE SECTION 20 | E SECTION 2.0 | |
| Conforms to / me | Conforms to / meass all Support Specifications as standard features = 5 points | |
| Conforms to / me | Conforms to ℓ means most (25+) Support Specifications as standard features = 4 points | |
| Conforms to / me points | Conforms to / meets some (15-25) Support Specifications as standard features, with some as optional = 3 points | |
| Conforms to / me | Conforms to / meals few (5-15) Support Specifications as standard features, with most as optional = 2 points | |
| Conforms to or m | Conforms to or meets no Support Specifications as standard features, with most as optional = 1 point | |

EVALUATOR NAME:
DATE:
OFFEROR NAME:

(F

| G E | raining Spa | 3.0 Training Spacifications (Ref. RFF: Section 4.0) | Gantorns: Boss Not Conform 2 Poolins |
|---------------|---------------------|---|--|
| 7 | Vendor off | Vendor offers a comprehensive, customized training program for the primary users of the system (school and District Webmasters, hearbers, And students) | |
| 6 | Vendor offe | Vendor offers reasonable support to the trained inclividuals in the form of manuals and other materials | |
| | Training co | Training covers all aspects of the system, including system setup, system use, accessing technical support, and all other critical features | |
| | TOTALS SECTION 3.0 | N 3.0 | |
| 3 | RALL SCOR | OVERALL SCORE SECTION 3.0 | a de como de de como d |
| Con | orms to all Tr | Conforms to all Training Specifications = 5 points | |
| 3 | orms to most | Conforms to most Training Specifications = 3 points | |
| Con | orms to faw c | Conforms to tew or no Training Specifications = 0 points | |
| | Xper encerR | 4.0 ExperienceReferences (RFP: Seption 7.4.4) | Yes No. 1 No. 2 coolins |
| ş | Did compa | Did company provide names of at least five (5) cliant references? | |
| 42 | Did compa | Did company provide names of more than five (5) client references? | |
| 4 € | Were mas | Were most of these references E-rate approved? | |
| 4. | Were all o | Were all of these references E-rate approved? | |
| in) | Was mon | Was more than one of these from a large public school district (comparable in size to Richland One)? | |
| 201 | TOTAL S SECTION 4.0 | N 4.0 | And an analysis and a second s |
| Š | RALL SCOR | OVERALL SCORE SECTION 4.0 | |
| Total | I for Experient | Total for Experience/References is 10 ≈ 5 points | |
| Total | I for Experien | Total for Experience/References is 8-9 = 4 points | |
| | for Experient | Total for Experiences/References is 5-7 = 3 points | |
| | | | |

| 5 D'Cost/(Ref. REP_Exhibit B. Pricing Schedule) | Total One-Time cost is | Total Annual Cost Is | Total perpant E-rate eligible is | Should Richland One apply for but not be approved for E-rate in the amount specified, would discounts be provided to metch the Company's estimates of E-rate? | | OVERALL SCORE SECTION 5.0 |
|---|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---|--------------------|---------------------------|
| P. Exminit Br | Time cost is. | ral Cost is | ant E-rate elig | hland One al m/s estimate | N 5.0 | SECTION |
| SE (Ref. RE | Total One- | Total Amil | Total percy | Should Ric | TOTALS SECTION 5.0 | ALL SCOR |
| 2005 | នៅ | ro S | Sid. | ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## ## | TOTA | O |

| | ден и при при при при при при при при при п | popular contractor and an experience of the contractor and the contrac |
|--|--|--|
| | TOTAL POINTS | WEIGHTED SCORE |
| SECTION 1.0 – Service (20%) | | (total x .20) = |
| SECTION 2.0 - Support (20%) | | (total x .20) = |
| SECTION 3.0 - Training (20%) | | (total x .20) == |
| SECTION 4.0 - Experience/References (15%) | A MAN CONTRACTOR AND | = (31. x lajo)) |
| SECTION 5.0 - Cost (25%) | | (total x .25) == |
| GRAND TOTAL | | |
| A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE | <u>"Signes skraters (Volkalistis (Volkalistis prominentis (Articles (Volkalistis proprintentis Prominentis Profession (Volkalistis Profession Pro</u> | |



Universal Service Administrative Company

Schools & Libraries Division

Administrator's Decision on Appeal – Funding Year 2006-2007

March 27, 2007

Walter L. Fox Richland County School District One 1616 Richland Street Columbia, SC 29201

Re: Applicant Name:

RICHLAND COUNTY SCHOOL DIST 1

Billed Entity Number:

127145

Form 471 Application Number:

507445 1394371

Funding Request Number(s): Your Correspondence Dated:

April 06, 2007

After thorough review and investigation of all relevant facts, the Schools and Libraries Division (SLD) of the Universal Service Administrative Company (USAC) has made its decision in regard to your appeal of USAC's Funding Year 2006 Funding Commitment Decision Letter for the Application Number indicated above. This letter explains the basis of USAC's decision. The date of this letter begins the 60 day time period for appealing this decision to the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). If your Letter of Appeal included more than one Application Number, please note that you will receive a separate letter for each application.

<u>Funding Request Number(s)</u>:

1394371

Decision on Appeal:

Denied

Explanation:

• During appeal review, it was determined that price was not the primary factor in selecting the service provider. A review of the documentation submitted in response to the Selective Review Information Request indicates that five bids were received for this funding request, but only four were evaluated as one of the bids was deemed to have not met the RFP specs. The remaining four bidders (Echalk, School Center, Sprint and Timecruiser) were evaluated based on the technical aspects of the bids. Those bidders were then reduced to three bidders and a cost evaluation was completed. Sprint was dropped from the cost evaluation based on a low technical proposal result. Of the three bidders remaining, Echalk was the chosen bidder. The fact that Sprint was dropped from the cost evaluation shows that price was not part of the initial evaluation. You

have not provided evidence on appeal that USAC has erred in its original determination. The appeal is denied.

• FCC Rules require that applicants select the most cost-effective products and/or services offering with price being the primary factor. Applicants may take other factors into consideration, but in selecting the winning bid, price must be given more weight than any other single factor. 47 C.F.R. sec. 54.511(a); Request for Review by Ysleta Independent School District, et. al., Federal-State Joint Board on Universal Service, Changes to the Board of Directors of the National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc., CC Docket Nos. 96-45, 97-21, Order, 18 FCC Rcd 26407, 26429, FCC 03-313 para. 50 (rel. Dec. 8, 2003). Ineligible products and services may not be factored into the cost-effective evaluation. See Common Carrier Bureau Reiterates Services Eligible for Discounts to Schools and Libraries, CC Docket No. 96-45, Public Notice, 13 FCC Rcd 16570, DA 98-1110 (rel. Jun. 11, 1998).

If your appeal has been approved, but funding has been reduced or denied, you may appeal these decisions to either USAC or the FCC. For appeals that have been denied in full, partially approved, dismissed, or canceled, you may file an appeal with the FCC. You should refer to CC Docket No. 02-6 on the first page of your appeal to the FCC. Your appeal must be received or postmarked within 60 days of the date on this letter. Failure to meet this requirement will result in automatic dismissal of your appeal. If you are submitting your appeal via United States Postal Service, send to: FCC, Office of the Secretary, 445 12th Street SW, Washington, DC 20554. Further information and options for filing an appeal directly with the FCC can be found in the "Appeals Procedure" posted in the Reference Area of the SLD section of the USAC website or by contacting the Client Service Bureau. We strongly recommend that you use the electronic filing options.

We thank you for your continued support, patience and cooperation during the appeal process.

Schools and Libraries Division Universal Service Administrative Company

(HARDISON)

| S |
|-----|
| S |
| ₫ |
| |
| m |
| ₩ |
| _ |
| z |
| ó |
| 뜯 |
| ď |
| - |
| ᇽ |
| 7 |
| ⋜ |
| 2 |
| ۳. |
| ၂ |
| ٩ |
| ഗ്ര |
| Ò |
| ዹ |
| Ö |
| ፈ |
| ۵. |
| |

RFP NO.: 88-04-0340 PROPOSAL TITLE: WEB-BASED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM

| Coloration | | A CAN III MAN | 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 | SECTION 1.0, SERVIC | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|---------------------|--|--|
| 1,150 1,15 | KFF SCURECARD | EVALUATOR | ECHALK | SCHOOL CENTER | SPRINT | TIMECRUISER | |
| 2.05 | | 1- MW | 131.00 | 136.00 | 40.00 | 11 | 18.00 September 18.00 Septembe |
| 1.00 | | 2-CS | 128.00 | 130.00 | 34.00 | 11 | 12,00 |
| Color Colo | | 7-W-H | 12B OO | 118 00 | 48 00 | <u> </u> | 14 Officer and the second seco |
| Color Colo | oberennen en e | 4. DT | 190 001 | 100 OCF | 50 08 | 4448 hatshark shaffan shaman an an afailish | та пределение при |
| 1.00 | THE RESIDENCE AND ADDRESS OF THE PROPERTY OF T | C a | 00 000 | 00 011 | 20.00 | | |
| 1.00 | | 200 | 00.021 | 00.01 | 20.00 | 71 | |
| C | And special solid | 808 | 00.721 | 100.00 | 78.00 | | D2.50 |
| Suconstant Suc | | 7- JW | 131.00 | 122.50 | 00.0 | 1 | 18.50 |
| 1002.00 1002 | | 8.00 | 130,00 | 121.00 | 12.00 | 11 | 12.00 per procession of the contract of the co |
| 123-96 | TOTAL POINTS: | | 1032.50 | 965.50 | 247.00 | -6 | 18,00 |
| FAME | AVERAGE SCORE ACHIEVED | | 199 061 | 130 CC | 88.02 | T | |
| EVALLATION 1,000 | ALC FOODE ACUELEDAMAN OTO ACUELO GOLD | 2007 | 2000 | 50,02) | 00.05 | | |
| Marcharor | AVE. SCURE ACREMENTALIMAN FIS. ACREMENTELE | 138 | 0.94 | 78.0 | 0.22 | 3 | 0.83 |
| EVALUATOR ECHALK SCHOOL CRITER STRINT TAMECRIJISER | WEIGHTED | 20.00% | 18.70 | 17.49 | 4.47 | | 16.63 жектинетинестинетинестинетинетинетинетинетинетинетинетинетине |
| FMALIATOR ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER SPRINT THRECRIBESED 14.00 | | | | SECTION 30 SHEET | Ward of the Control | Control of the second second second | |
| 1- MAY | 000 6000000 | DIATOR | 7 17 17 17 1 | STATE OF THE STATE | 1 | 10001000 | |
| 1-1MV 28.00 58.00 15.0 | ALL SOCIECAND | EVALUATOR | | SCHOOL CENIER | STRINI | IMECKUISEK | |
| 2. C5 | | 1. MW | 58.00 | 54.00 | 15.00 | | 0.00 protection and an advantagement of the contract of the co |
| A D | | 2-CS | 57.00 | 26.00 | 20.00 | es. | 33.06 |
| Fig. 200 25.00 24.00 2 | THE TRANSPORT OF THE PROPERTY | 3. M.H | | 24 00 | 90 06 | 7 | |
| F-D SSON SSON SALW STON SALW SALW STON SALW | THE PERSON NAMED AND PE | 1.4 | 00.00 | 00.47 | 00.02 | 3 | |
| Chief Color | *************************************** | 4-DI | 58.00 | 35.00 | 24.00 | *************************************** | 3.00 |
| Column C | | 5- 30 | 56,00 | 37.00 | 34.00 | 7 | 14.00 mentions and an article of the control of the |
| 7.1W 57.00 45.00 0.00 9.cc 481.50 381.00 318.00 150.00 150.00 481.50 318.00 318.00 150.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 4.00 150.0 | | 6- BB | 56.50 | 46.00 | 29.00 | 4 | 12.00 байын такжы такжы такжы такжы такжы байын такжы та |
| Section Sect | | 7- JW | 57.00 | 45.00 | NO 0 | | |
| See | | | 00 85 | 39.00 | 00 8 | Y | постання при |
| See Second | TOTAL BOMMTC. | | 400 004 | | | | |
| SAB | | | ne ne | inn'ene | nn'nei. | 97 | 70. VV ризними менения выправления в применти в примен |
| 1938 | SCHAGE SCORE ACTION | *************************************** | 56,31 | 47.78 | 18.75 | , | 56.00 управодение переперативности пределение пределени |
| EVALUATOR ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER SPRINT TIMECRUISER | 4X. P.I.S. ACHIEVABLE/AVG. SCORE ACHIEVED | 58 | 0.99 | 0.82 | 0.32 | | 0.62) политичний полит |
| EVALUATOR ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER SPRINT TIMEGRUISER | EIGHTED | 20.00% | 19.76 | 16.48 | 6.47 | | 2.4 |
| EVALUATOR ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER SPRINT TIMECRUISER | | | | SECTION 3 0 TRAIN | | | |
| 1-MW 6.00 | P SCORECARD | EVALUATOR | ECHALK | SCHOOL CENTER | 1 | TIMECRIIISER | |
| 2-CS 4.00 4.00 6.00 <th< td=""><td></td><td>1- MW</td><td>00.8</td><td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td></th<> | | 1- MW | 00.8 | | | 1 | |
| A DT | FOR THE PROPERTY AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPE | 2.08 | 00 7 | 00 7 | 000 | | или в применя в применения в применения применения в прим |
| 4-DT 6.00 6.00 2.00 5-JO 6.00 6.00 4.00 2.00 5-JO 6.00 6.00 6.00 6.00 7-JW 6.00 6.00 4.00 6.00 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6.00 6.00 6.00 7-JW 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6.00 6.00 7-JW 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6.00 6.00 7-JW 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6-cc 6.00 7-JW 6-cc | | 7-W-E | 8.00 | 00 8 | 20.0 | a de la contractación de l | 3 00 |
| 5-JO 6.00 4.00 5.00 6-BB 6.00 4.00 5.00 7-JW 6.00 4.00 6.00 8-cc 6.00 4.00 6.00 8-cc 6.00 4.00 6.00 8-cc 6.00 4.00 6.00 8-cc 6.00 5.00 7.00 8-cs 6.00 2.00 0.00 8-cs 6.00 2.00 0.00 8-cs 6.00 2.00 0.00 8-de 6.00 4.00 0.00 8-de 6.00 4.00 0.00 8-de 6.00 4.00 0.00 8-de 6.00 4.00 0.00 8-de 6.00 6.00 0.00 | ninna kaana kanaa kata ka | 4. DT | A DO | A 00 | 00 0 | *************************************** | |
| 6-BB 6-00 4-00 5-00 7-JW 6-00 6-00 6-00 6-00 7-JW 6-00 4-00 6-00 6-00 8-cc 46.00 4-00 20.00 3-60 8-cc 6-36 4-00 20.00 3-60 8-cc 6-36 0.28 0.58 0.58 0.58 1-MVATOR ECHALK SECTION 40. EXPERIENCES 116.77 TIMECRUSER 1-MVA ECHALK 8.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 2-CS 6.00 2.00 4.00 0.00 0.00 0.00 3-M-H 6.00 2.00 4.00 2.00 0.00 <td></td> <td>Ç</td> <td></td> <td>20.0</td> <td>50.7</td> <td>***************************************</td> <td></td> | | Ç | | 20.0 | 50.7 | *************************************** | |
| Color Colo | | 275 | 00.0 | 00.4 | 3.00 | | TO THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPERT |
| 7. JW | mantamini kanan ini mantaman kala kala kala kala kala kala kala ka | & BB | 0.09 | 4.00 | 5,00 | and the state of t | 5.00 processor of the control of the |
| B-CC 6.00 4.00 6.00 46.00 46.00 40.00 3.60 6 6.36 6.03 3.60 5.73 6.03 3.60 3.60 Consist 0.36 0.36 3.60 ALLUATOR ECHALK SECTION 4.0 EXPERIENCES 116.7 LAWW ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER SPRINT TIMECRUISER 1-MW ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER SPRINT TIMECRUISER 2-CS 6.00 2.00 4.00 4.00 2-CS 6.00 2.00 4.00 2.00 3-M-H 6.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 4-DT 6.00 4.00 2.00 2.00 5-JO 8.00 4.00 6.00 4.00 6-BB 8.00 4.00 6.00 4.00 8-CC 8.00 4.00 8.00 6.00 8-CC 8.00 4.00 8.00 6.00 8-CC <th< td=""><td></td><td>7- JW</td><td>6.00</td><td>0.00</td><td>00:0</td><td></td><td>3.00 mm months management and the control of the co</td></th<> | | 7- JW | 6.00 | 0.00 | 00:0 | | 3.00 mm months management and the control of the co |
| F | | 25.50 | 0.00 | 4.00 | 6.00 | | В температиру при |
| 6 6.08 5.06 3.50 20,00% 19.17 SECTION 4.0, EXPERIENCES 11.67 EVALUATOR ECHALK SECTION 4.0, EXPERIENCES 11.67 1- MW ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER 11.67 2- CS 6.00 S.00 4.00 2- CS 6.00 2.00 0.00 3- M-H 6.00 2.00 2.00 4- DT 6.00 2.00 2.00 4- DT 6.00 2.00 4.00 5- JO 8.00 2.00 4.00 6- BB 8.00 8.00 8.00 8- C 6.88 8.0 8.00 8- C 6.88 8.00 8.00 8- C 6.88 8.00 8.00 8- C 6.88 8.00 8.00 8- C 6.88 </td <td>TOTAL POINTS:</td> <td></td> <td>46.00</td> <td>40.00</td> <td>08 00</td> <td></td> <td>AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER</td> | TOTAL POINTS: | | 46.00 | 40.00 | 08 00 | | AND THE PROPERTY OF THE PROPER |
| Colors | VERAGE SCORE ACHIEVED | | 5.75 | 00 8 | 3 40 | | 2 Special and the state of the |
| EVALUATOR | AY PTS ACHIEVARI FIAVO SCORE ACHIEVED | 4 | 20.0 | | 1000 C | *************************************** | TATALAN TATALAN TATALAN TATALAN AN TATALAN |
| EVALUATOR ECHALK SECTION 4.0. EXPERIENCE; REFERENCES 11.67 | | | 05.0 | 20.0 | 90.0 | | у 48. |
| EVALUATOR SECTION 4.0. EXPERIENCE REFERENCES | | 20.00% | 19.17 | 16.67 | | | 9.58 жизине при |
| EVALUATOR ECHALK SCHOOL CENTER SPRINT TIMECRUISE 1-MW 8.00 8.00 4.00 4.00 2-CS 6.00 0.00 2.00 0.00 3-M-H 6.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 4-DT 6.00 2.00 2.00 2.00 5-JO 7.00 4.00 2.00 4.00 6-BB 8.00 4.00 0.00 6.00 8-CC 8.00 8.00 8.00 6.00 6-BB 8.00 8.00 0.02 6.00 6-BB 8.00 8.00 0.26 0.02 6-BB 8.00 8.00 0.26 0.02 6-BB 8.00 0.02 < | | | | SECTION 4.0, EXPERIENCE / I | REFERENCES | | |
| 1-MW 8.00 8.00 4.00 2-CS 6.00 2.05 0.00 3-M-H 6.00 2.00 2.00 4-DT 6.00 2.00 2.00 5-JQ 7.00 4.00 2.00 6-BB 8.00 2.00 4.00 7-JW 8.00 8.00 6.00 8-c 6.89 30.00 6.00 10-0 6.00 2.00 6.00 15-0 8.00 8.00 6.00 15-0 6.03 33.76 2.50 15-0 10.31 5.63 3.76 15-0 10.31 5.62 26.36 15-0 10.31 75.62 26.36 | P SCORECARD | EVALUATOR | ECHALK | SCHOOL CENTER | SPRINT | TIMECRUISER | |
| 2-CS 6.00 2.00 0.00 4-DT 6.00 2.00 2.00 4-DT 6.00 2.00 2.00 5-JO 7.00 4.00 2.00 6- SB 8.00 4.00 2.00 7-JW 8.00 4.00 4.00 8- cc 8.00 4.00 0.00 8- cc 6.88 3.76 2.50 15,00% 10.38 0.25 2.50 15,00% 10.38 3.76 2.50 15,00% 10.38 3.76 2.50 15,00% 10.38 3.76 3.76 15,00% 10.38 2.50 2.50 15,00% 10.38 2.50 2.50 15,00% 10.38 2.50 2.50 10 10.40 10.40 2.50 2.50 10 10.40 10.40 2.50 2.50 10 10.40 10.40 2.50 2.50 10 | HONOR CONTRACTOR CONTR | 1- MW | 8.00 | 8.00 | | | 000 |
| 3-M-H 6.00 0.00 2.00 | | 2-CS | 9.00 | 2.00 | 000 | *************************************** | |
| 4-DT 6.00 2.00 | | 3- M-H | 900 | 200 | 000 | | |
| F-01 F-02 | | A. D.T. | | 0000 | 20.0 | *************************************** | |
| Color | A DECIDENT THE PROPERTY OF THE | | 00.0 | Total Control | 7007 | 474) 4416 h (147424) h dadam mananananananan | |
| C | | Of -c: | nr.) | 4.00 | 2.00 | | 6.00 mm. m. |
| 7JW | | 6-38 | 8.00 | 2.00 | 4.00 | | 6.00 |
| B-cc B-00 B-00 B-00 | | 7- JW | 8.00 | 4,00 | 0.00 | | 4.00 |
| 55.00 30.00 20.00 6.88 3.75 2.60 16.00% 10.31 2.60 T5.00% 10.31 5.63 0.25 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESULTS 26.36 | | 8-cc | 8.00 | 8.00 | 00.9 | | 10.00 properties and a second |
| 10 6.88 3.75 2.50 15,00% 0.68 0.25 0.25 16,00% 10.31 5.53 3.76 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESULTS 56.26 26.36 | TOTAL POINTS: | | 55.00 | 30.00 | 20.00 | | 38.00 |
| 10 0.68 0.38 0.25 15.00% 10.31 5.63 3.76 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESULTS 67.95 56.26 26.36 | VERAGE SCORE ACHIEVED | | 6.88 | 3.75 | 2.50 | | 4.78 |
| 16.00% 10.31 5.63 3.75 | IAX. PTS. ACHIEVABLE/AVG. SCORE ACHIEVED | 10 | 680 | 0.38 | 700 | | |
| TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESULTS 67.95 56.26 26.36 | VEIGHTED | 15.00% | 10.31 | 5 83 | 37.5 | | 7.42 |
| : (WEIGHTED SCORES) 67.95 TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESULTS 67.95 | | The state of the s | | | | | |
| : (WEIGHTED SCORES) 67.95 56.26 26.36 | | | | TECHNICAL PROPOSAL | RESULTS | | |
| THE PARTY OF THE P | TOTAL: (WEIGHTED SCORES) | | 67.95 | 3 | | 45 | то пределение при пределение пределение пределение пределение пределение пределение пределение пределение пред |
| | The state of the s | | | | | | |

| RFP NO.: 88-04-0340 PROPOSAL TITLE: WEB-BASED COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM | PROF | ROPOSAL EVALUATION RESULTS | V RESULTS | | | |
|--|--------------|----------------------------|-----------|--|----------|-------|
| DATE: NOVEMBER 23, 2003 | | | | | | |
| | | COST PROPOSAL RESULTS | ULTS | | | |
| OFFEROR: | Z | × | | | \ | Z |
| TMECRUSER | \$491,962.00 | \$491,962.00 | 1.00 | | 25.00 | 25.00 |
| SCHOOL CENTER | \$491,962.00 | \$883,500.00 | 0.56 | | 25.00 | 13.92 |
| •-сна <u>г</u> к | \$491,962.00 | \$1,442,000.00 | 0.34 | | 25.00 | 8.53 |

N = LOWEST PROPOSAL COST SUBMITTED
X = PROPOSAL COST
Y = MAXIMUM POINTS FOR COST PROPOSAL
Z = POINTS TO AWARD TO PROPOSAL FOR COST PROPOSAL

| | | GRAND TOTAL: | FINAL RANKING |
|--------------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| PROPOSAL RESU | E-CHALK | 76.48 | |
| LTS (COMBINED TECH | SCHOOL CENTER | 70,18 | en |
| HNICAL AND COST S | TIMECRUISER | 70.75 | 2 |
| CORES) | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

. JESS:
1. BASED ON SPRINT'S LOW TECHNICAL PROPOSAL RESULT, SPRINT WAS ASSESSED TO BE NON-COMPETITIVE AND THEREFORE NO COST PROPOSAL ANALYSIS WAS COMPLETED.

(HARDISON)

Exhibit D

MEMORANDUM

TO: Luke Fox

FROM: Robert Hardison

DATE: May 1, 2007

SUBJECT: RFP No. 88-04-0340, Web-based Communications System

Luke,

Re: Your e-mail to Lashonda Outing and me dated 4/2/2007

Provided below are my responses to your questions:

Q1. SLD is citing a violation of FCC Rules requiring us to use cost as the most heavily weighted criteria.

A1: The solicitation was conducted as a Request for Proposal with the evaluation criteria and weighting as follows: See RFP, page 22, Section 8.2.2

a. Cost 25% (highest weighted criteria was Cost)

b. Support 20% c. Training 20% d. Service 20% e. Experience/References 15%

100%

Q2: The SLD states that we received five proposals and dropped one from consideration because it did not meet the specs in the RFP. The remaining four (eChalk, School Center, Sprint, and Timecruiser) were evaluated.

A2: The District received five (5) proposals:

> 1. Blackboard Inc.

1899 L Street

Washington, DC 20036

Note: Blackboard Inc. was determined to be non-responsive in

accordance with the District Procurement Code. Their submittal was only a marketing submittal for information only. They did not sign the solicitation certification statement and did not respond to

Amendments issued.

2. eChalk. LLC

> 26 Broadway, Suite 941 New York, NY 10004

3. School Center

1050 Reed Station Road

Carbondale, IL 62901

- Sprint
 400 Northeast Drive, Suites G & H
 Columbia, SC 29203
- Timecruiser Computing Corporation
 Law Drive. 3rd Floor
- Q3: They (SLD) stated we dropped Sprint at this time for some un-documented reason BEFORE cost was considered as a criterion. They state this violates FCC Rules.
- A3: All five proposals were evaluated by the District Evaluation Panel, which consisted of eight (8) members.

The Blackboard proposal was determined to be non-responsive by the Procurement Manager and was eliminated from further consideration.

The remaining four proposals were evaluated by the District Evaluation Panel.

eChalk received the most points and was the highest ranking offeror based on the results of the Technical Proposal evaluation.

School Center was ranked second. Timecruiser was ranked third. Sprint was ranked fourth (last).

The Sprint Technical Proposal was fully evaluated and was determined to be technically deficient by the evaluation panel and received the least amount of points and was ranked last. The Sprint proposal would not have been chosen regardless of their offered price.

This solicitation was conducted in full accordance with the District Procurement Code. The District used the competitive sealed proposals (RFP) process as the method of source selection. This method is used when it has been determined that factors others than price may be considered. Price was the criterion given the most weight in the scoring.

This item was approved by our Board of School Commissioner's on 06-22-04

In accordance with the District Procurement Code, an Intent to Award Statement was issued on 06-24-04 and a Purchase Order was issued to eChalk on 07-08-04.

If you should have any questions please contact me directly at 231-7040.

Thanks.